UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

2008 JUL 15 AM 10: 19

TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE / 7/10/2008		
CAS	E NO.: <u>08</u>	cv0125 JM (BLM) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner
CASE TITLE: Brooks v. Clark, et al		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: <u>Ex Parte Motion for Enlargement of Time</u>		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
√ I	Local Rule	Discrepancy
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
X	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
	7.1	Missing table of contents
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
		Supplemental documents require court order
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
		OTHER:
Date forwarded: <u>7/11/2008</u> ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
1	The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.	
	The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
	Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1 CHAMBERS OF: ARRAY MAJOR	
	Dated: 71	CHAMBERS OF: BARRAR MAJOR By: LAM (clerk)